

Message

From: Kraft, Andrew [Kraft.Andrew@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/9/2018 3:02:03 PM
To: Shams, Dahnish [Shams.Dahnish@epa.gov]; Avery, James [Avery.James@epa.gov]
CC: Subramaniam, Ravi [Subramaniam.Ravi@epa.gov]; Rieth, Susan [Rieth.Susan@epa.gov]; Glenn, Barbara [Glenn.Barbara@epa.gov]; Bussard, David [Bussard.David@epa.gov]; Ramasamy, Santhini [Ramasamy.Santhini@epa.gov]
Subject: Fw: Formaldehyde assessment fact sheet
Attachments: SummaryBriefingHCHOLeukemia030818.docx

Hi Sue and Ravi,

I think Dahnish and James are both out today, so I am reaching out to you. We are curious if there are any SSCs who are not currently very busy and might be interested in extracting conclusions and supporting information on carcinogenicity from other agency assessments of formaldehyde? Specifically, we would be interested in starting with the most recent ATSDR (circa 2010 update of the 2005? report) and NTP's report on carcinogens (circa 2012 or so) assessments.

We are (still) in the process of briefing the IOAA and others, and Ryan Jackson asked Jennifer for information regarding other agency assessments of formaldehyde. In particular, he was interested in their conclusions and the "key studies" supporting those conclusions, including how "strong" those studies were and why they were relied on. I have attached a draft we developed for Tina/Jennifer on leukemia that could serve as a model, although the level of detail in the attached is more than we would need extracted from the other agency assessments (e.g., we probably don't need the study-specific relative risks, and definitely not a figure of any sort). This draft is not a model they would need to follow, as we want to leave some flexibility for the SSCs to develop the summaries in their own way.

It would be a fairly short turnaround time, so if folks are not available or uninterested in the near term, please disregard this request. It is also not a high priority- Jennifer and Ryan may or may not ask for these summaries again, although they would still prove useful for future briefings and communications materials on formaldehyde. Depending on the product and the LOE, we might subsequently ask for extraction from other agencies (e.g., IARC, Health Canada, and SCOEL).

Thanks either way, and happy Friday.
-Andrew and Barbara

From: Bussard, David
Sent: Friday, March 9, 2018 9:36 AM
To: Kraft, Andrew
Cc: Glenn, Barbara
Subject: RE: Formaldehyde assessment fact sheet

Give it a try! We'll learn something.

From: Kraft, Andrew
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2018 9:31 AM
To: Bussard, David <Bussard.David@epa.gov>

Cc: Glenn, Barbara <Glenn.Barbara@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Formaldehyde assessment fact sheet

I was thinking of providing our leukemia draft as a starting place and letting the SSC pull what he/she thinks is most pertinent, without spending a lot of time providing guidance on how to do so. It would be a good learning experience for them and would be very "hands-off"/ low time commitment for Barbara, Tom, and I. Of course, we'd have to check it afterwards, but if the SSCs have free time and are interested, I think it is more efficient than our team doing it (or taking time training them how to do it). Even if it is not needed now, it will be good information to have for the Q&As. I would also be interested in collecting similar information from IARC, Health Canada and SCOEL, as I think they will be raised by outside parties, but perhaps that is a secondary effort if the NTP and ATSDR pulls are done well...

-Andrew

From: Bussard, David
Sent: Friday, March 9, 2018 9:25 AM
To: Kraft, Andrew
Cc: Glenn, Barbara
Subject: RE: Formaldehyde assessment fact sheet

Per conversation, let's initially focus only on ATSDR and NTP.

I don't know that we want a long spreadsheet or something where a row is a document and a column is whether the other organization looked at that study.... But, discerning which studies were "key" in assessments by others is sometimes not transparent, so I don't know if that is easy to do... {Are lucky enough that there is any automated way to compare reference lists?}

I was wondering if lit search cut-off dates is a fast shorthand. But, if there were major differences in how the groups considered data, that might not be sufficient.

Do you have a hypothesis of what we would provide?

David

From: Kraft, Andrew
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2018 9:16 AM
To: Bussard, David <Bussard.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Glenn, Barbara <Glenn.Barbara@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Formaldehyde assessment fact sheet

It might be good to get them started on pulling the basis for other agency's carcinogenicity conclusions... but, I don't think it is worthwhile to have them pull things from our assessment at this time.

From: Bussard, David
Sent: Friday, March 9, 2018 7:40 AM

To: Kraft, Andrew

Subject: Re: Formaldehyde assessment fact sheet

Unless there is some work the SSCs could do that you think will be used.

David Bussard

On Mar 8, 2018, at 4:50 PM, Kraft, Andrew <Kraft.Andrew@epa.gov> wrote:

I'm guessing I should wait until we hear back from Tina before doing anything on nasal cancers?
